

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/708,858	03/29/2004	Richard G. Struve	03-1088 (BOE 0481 PA)	2857
27256	7590 04/06/2005		EXAMINER	
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.			HOLZEN, STEPHEN A	
28333 TELEGRAPH RD. SUITE 250 SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/708,858	STRUVE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stephen A. Holzen	3644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fe	ebruary 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-15,17-25 and 27-35 is/are pending if 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,15,17,25,27 and 30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2-14,17-24 and 27-35 is/are objected 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. S have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. While updating the search, the examiner found a new reference that would render obvious the applicant's claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 15, 17, 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Specht et al (5,985,362) in view of Klapper et al (5,312,848). Specht et al disclose a hydrophobic foam structure to fit between an adjacent pair of frames, compression fitting at least one layer of the foam between frames so that the layer substantially covers at least one of a plurality of stringer, and coupling a trim piece over said layer such that said layer is sandwiched between said trim piece and said outer skin (see Figures 3 and 4). Specht et al teach every aspect of the present invention except wherein the hydrophobic foam structure is open celled. Klapper et al discloses that it is well known in the art to use open celled foams for insulating aircrafts. (see abstract). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having

Art Unit: 3644

ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Klapper et al into the invention of Specht for the purpose of decreasing overall aircraft weight.

Specht in view of Klapper discloses every aspect of the present invention except wherein the hydrophobic open-celled foam structure comprises a melamine-based, thermosetting open-cell foam structure. Thom (2001/0041753) discloses that it is known to use a melamine, open celled, foam in vehicle interiors to increase protection from fire and for sound absorption (see Col. 1, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to use the teachings of Thom to increase the safety of the aircraft.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 30-35 are objected to because of the following informalities: the applicant did not amend the dependency after canceling claim 26. Appropriate correction is required. The examiner has examined this case with the assumption that claim 30 was meant to be dependent from claim 25.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 703-308-2484. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00. After April 4th the examiner can be reached on 571-272-6903.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703-305-7421. After April 4th, Mrs. Luu can be

reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sah

TERI PHAM LUU SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER